JETIR.ORG ISSN: 2349-5162 | ESTD Year : 2014 | Monthly Issue

JOURNAL OF EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES AND INNOVATIVE RESEARCH (JETIR)

An International Scholarly Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

Corporate Governance Theoretical Framework and Models – A review

[*]Dr. R. Jayaprakash Reddy

Professor, Department of Commerce

AIMS Centre for Advanced Research Centre, Peenya
Bangalore, Karnataka

Vinayak S Angadi
PhD Research Scholar,
University of Mysore, Karnataka

Abstract

In this research paper, relevant theoretical dimensions of corporate governance are discussed. This research paper examines many theories and corporate governance models that have been applied globally, examining their respective advantages and disadvantages. The objectives are to find the best theory and model and to test its applicability to different economic systems. This notion has frequently been referenced in corporate governance theory to help the board of directors make judgments about how to limit the amount of executive power that management has. The Agency Theory is helpful for this goal, but it offers little assistance on corporate governance in complex real-world settings. The current governance structure, which is founded on the Agency Theory, has become self-restrictive and ineffective as a result of the combining of the principal and agent roles. The legal obligation of the board of directors is to act in the interests of the shareholders, there have been instances where attempts to supplement the Agency Theory with alternative theoretical frameworks like the Stakeholder Theory and the Stewardship Theory. Although it offers fresh perspectives, a governance model based on the Trusteeship notion nevertheless has some practical problems. As a result, the board members have not found these alternative frameworks to be very helpful in helping them determine what makes the "correct" option. Therefore, we require fresh theoretical perspectives that could lead to a systematic model of corporate governance.

Key words*:* Corporate Governance, Theory, Model, Economy, Stakeholder, Independent Director

Introduction:

"The word "Governance" comes from the Latin verb "gubernare," which denotes "to steer." The Governance terminology used in this research paper refers to the direction and control of a business in the context of corporations. Corporate governance is the mechanism by which businesses are directed and governed, according to various experts' definitions of the term. Operations at the corporation are governed by a system of laws, regulations, and other elements. It entails managing the company in accordance with the preferences of the stakeholders. It is carried out to the benefit of the company's stakeholders by the board of directors and the relevant committees.

It all comes down to striking a balance between social and economic as well as individual and communal interests. An organization's owners and managers need to get along well, and there shouldn't be any tension between them. The owners must ensure that the employee performs at a level consistent with their expected level of performance. It is important to consider these aspects of corporate governance.

Modern organizations should clearly define rather than harmonies the roles and responsibilities of owners and managers. It is determined using a variety of methods to make wise strategic decisions, and it gives the Board of Directors final say and full accountability. Globalization is a crucial role in creating added value for the stakeholders in today's market-oriented economy. Because corporate governance guarantees openness and balanced economic growth, it also ensures that the interests of all shareholders, whether majority and minority, are respected. It ensures that all shareholders completely exercise their rights and that the corporation properly acknowledges their rights. The main objective of contemporary corporate governance should be to provide a reliable, trustworthy, moral and ethical environment, a fair and transparent structure, accountable and democratic business behaviour are all required.

A wide phrase used to describe the procedures, dress codes, regulations, and rules that lead organizations and businesses in how they act, manage, and oversee their activities is corporate governance. Corporate governance is a collection of rules that historically has defined the guidelines for making business decisions that are applicable to a company's inked processes. The primary purpose of this set of rules and laws has been to settle disputes between agencies and to form the relationships between the board of directors, shareholders, and management. Good corporate governance includes responsible, value-based management and monitoring that is focused on long-term success, goal-oriented and effective cooperation between management and supervisory boards, consideration for the interests of shareholders and employees, transparency and responsibility in all entrepreneurial decisions, and an appropriate risk management system.

The Anglo-Saxon paradigm of corporate governance was developed as a result of the Agency Theory of

Corporate Governance, has become the foundation for corporate governance frameworks all over the world, including in India. The Anglo-Saxon model of corporate governance that was developed in the United Kingdom and the USA. The Corporate governance theory frequently makes reference to Anglo-Saxon model in order to provide direction to the board of directors in making decisions regarding how to restrict excessive executive power in management's hands. The Agency Theory is useful for achieving governance goals, but it is not very helpful for practicing corporate governance in challenging real-world situations. Because the principal and agent roles have been combined, the current governance structure, which is founded on the Agency Theory, has become self-restrictive and ineffective. The legal obligation of the board of directors to act in the best interests of the shareholders has occasionally been in conflict with attempts to supplement the Agency Theory with alternative theoretical frameworks such as the Stakeholder Theory and the Stewardship Theory.

A governance model based on the concept of Trusteeship, such as the Anglo-Saxon, German, Japanese, and Indian model of Corporate Governance, while offering new insights, suffers from implementation issues and is still something to strive for. As a result, the board members have not found these alternative frameworks to be very helpful in helping them determine what makes the "correct" option. We require fresh theoretical understandings that will lead us to a thorough theory of governance. To establish a trusting relationship between the company and its management, this research aims to concentrate on the many theoretical frameworks for c orporate governance. In emerging economies around the world, including India, where investors are not well protected, corporate governance has taken the position of investor protection.

Literature Review:

Business governance is concerned with how corporate managers use capital properly and generate a return to investors that is proportionate to the risk of the investment. Corporate governance is described as "the way in which financiers to firms assume themselves to earn a return on their investment" (Shleifer and Vishny, 1997). Corporate governance, as defined by the OECD (1999), is the structure used to direct and control business corporations.

Overview of Theories of Corporate Governance

There are numerous corporate governance theories that have addressed the issues and challenges of governance of corporations and companies from time to time. In this research paper, the focus is on the following important theories of corporate governance.

a. Agency theory of Corporate Governance
b. Stewardship theory of Corporate Governance
c. Stakeholder theory of Corporate Governance

Agency Theory of Corporate Governance

According to agency theory, the board of directors' principal obligation to the shareholders is to maximise shareholder value returns. The agency role of the directors refers to the board of directors' job of serving the shareholders by approving managerial decisions and overseeing their implementation.

Due to numerous information asymmetries, agency theory's emphasis on the interaction between principals and agents (such as shareholders and corporate management) has led to ambiguity (Deegan, 2004). Because of the possibility that managers will not act to maximise shareholder wealth due to firm-specific knowledge, capabilities and skills if ownership and management were separated, a monitoring system is created to safeguard the interests of shareholders (Jensen & Meckling, 1976).

The agency theory's implicit premise is that managers act in their own best interests and are opportunistic by nature, seizing every chance to maximize their own well-being which is to the detriment of the shareholders. Therefore, to resolve the agency dilemma, the theory focuses on discovering the governance standards to restrict the agent's selfish behavior. The theory outlines the function of an effective labor and capital market in regulating the managers' self-serving behavior.

The idea places a strong emphasis on the board of directors' responsibility to check managers' opportunism and rein in their tendency toward self-interest. According to the theory, an effective board consists mostly of members who are independent from and do not serve as managers of the company. These so-called independent directors have interests that are aligned with those of the shareholders.

The idea of separating ownership and control forms the foundation of the ideology. The managers are chosen by the shareholders, who are the company's owners, to act as their agents in achieving those goals. As a result, managers frequently vary from stockholders. The term "agency problem" refers to this type of objective conflict, which might motivate firm managers to behave in their own best interests. If a manager is rewarded for their performance, such as accounting profits, they would try to increase profits in order to enhance their bonus or salary by choosing an accounting approach that will increase profits.

The firm's managers possess both managerial expertise and knowledge relevant to the company. They therefore have an edge over the owners. The managers are given power over the company through this role. Thus, there is a goal conflict as managers work to further their own interests. The managers expropriate the funds in a variety of ways by using their control privileges to promote their own objectives. The managers could resorts to activities such as - pay inflated transfer prices to those connected to them; engage in insider trading; pay themselves excessive salaries; invest in deteriorating industry sectors; acquiring companies at inflated valuation and so on.

The owners find it difficult or impossible to confirm that the behavior of the agents is proper. The theory has recommended specific operational procedures to resolve the conflict of interest and safeguard the interests of the company's owners. Some measures could involve internal and external auditing, various contracts (written and unwritten) undertakings from the managers that such misuse of authority does not occur, modifications to the organizational structure that would restrict managers' access to unethical behavior among others.

Criticisms of the Agency Theory of Corporate Governance

a. One of the theory's most evident weaknesses is its emphasis on boosting shareholder wealth at the expense of other key stakeholders.
b. The theory is frequently critiqued for overstating the self-interested characteristics of people. In addition to their background, values, experience, and tactical abilities, board managers' behaviour may also be influenced by these factors rather than just whether they are insiders or outsiders.
c. As a result of block holding by banks or corporate families, It is less well-known in Germany, Japan, and the bulk of other Asian countries. The main agency issue in emerging nations has always been between majority and minority owners (and not between owners and managers).
d. Not applicable to underdeveloped nations

Stewardship Theory of Corporate Governance

Stewardship theory's foundations are founded on social psychology, which emphasizes on collectivism. The steward's behaviour is in the interest of the organization and it is more valuable than individualistic self-serving behaviour. It also won't stray from the organization's interests because the steward works to achieve the organization's goals (Davis, Schoorman & Donaldson 1997). According to stewardship theory of corporate governance, managers and a company's success are closely related, and as a result, stewards safeguard and maximize shareholder wealth through a company's performance. A steward who successfully improves performance is able to satisfy these stakeholder groups when the majority of them have interests that are well served by increasing organizational wealth. (Davis, Schoorman & Donaldson 1997). When the Chief Executive Officer and Chairman roles are shared by a single individual, that person is also responsible for the organization's fate and has the authority to make strategic decisions. Therefore, rather than monitor and control, stewardship theory places an emphasis on systems that facilitate and empower people (Davis, Schoorman & Donaldson 1997). Stewardship theory promotes the appointment of a single individual to serve as chairman and Chief Executive Officer and a team of specialized executive directors rather than non-executive directors.

As a result, it takes a more flexible approach to the separation of the roles of chairman and Chief Executive

Officer (Clarke 2004). An alternative to the agency idea of corporate governance is the stewardship hypothesis. The conflict of interest between managers and owners is eliminated. Donaldson and Davis assert that managers are trustworthy and unlikely to steal investors' money. The managers place a high emphasis on their own reputations. Business firms are seen by the idea, which is also known as "trusteeship theory," as a hub of long-standing trust connections. Instead of being seen as the construction of a private contract, the massive public business is seen as a social institution.

Stewardship Theory's presumptions:

a. Managers are responsible stewards of the business, working hard to maximize corporate profit and shareholder return. They are not only agents of the shareholders, as is commonly believed.
b. Managers are not opportunistic shirkers; rather, they truly want to do a good job and be great stewards whose motives are in accordance with the objectives of their principle.
c. The theory's advocates giving Chief Executive Officers, who are regarded as stewards, a lot of power and discretion.
d. Rather than on systems to keep an eye on and rein in managers, the theory focuses on the structures that help and empower them. Stewardship and agency ideas are at odds with one another. There may be some similarities between the two theories, though. In both perspectives, financial reporting, disclosure, and auditing are important tools for regulating managerial behaviour. While stewardship theories view the mechanism of control as confirming the managers' intrinsic reliability, agency theory posits that management behaviour is opportunistically geared toward personal advantages.

Stakeholder Theory of Corporate Governance

This idea is focused on problems involving an institution's stakeholders. According to this, a business entity must always strive to create a balance between the interests of all of its diverse stakeholders in order to ensure that each is satisfied to some level (Abrams, 1951). The theory, according to Coleman (2008): 4, is criticized for being too specific because it gives too much importance to shareholders as the only beneficiary in an organization. The stakeholder theory of corporate governance, however, by emphasizing various company constituents, performs better than the agency theory in understanding the importance of corporate governance (Coleman, 2008: 4). Since they are the firms' actual owners, shareholders are the only ones recognised under business law in the majority of nations. Due to this, the company has a fiduciary obligation to prioritise its clients' requirements and maximise returns. In more contemporary business models, the organisation transforms the contributions of its shareholders into forms that may be sold to customers, including those of its employees, suppliers, and investors. According to stakeholder theory, this model takes into account the requirements of customers, suppliers, employers, and investors.

Governmental entities, political parties, trade groups, trade unions, local communities, associated businesses, f uture employees, and the general public are among the parties involved.

In certain circumstances, it may be possible to classify rival businesses and potential customers as stakeholders in order to boost market business efficiency. The importance of the stakeholder theory has increased as a result of scholars' growing understanding of how corporate actions have an influence on the environment, necessitating the organization's accountability to parties other than its shareholders.

In certain circumstances, it may be possible to classify rival businesses and potential customers as stakeholders in order to boost market business efficiency. The importance of the stakeholder theory has increased as a result of scholars' growing understanding of how corporate actions have an influence on the environment, necessitating the organization's accountability to parties other than its shareholders. However, it is important to note that widespread acknowledgment of this truth is a very recent phenomenon. However, issues with the extension's empirical testing have reduced its applicability (Sanda et. al., 2005). Stakeholder theory of corporate governance takes a more comprehensive stance and emphasizes the need for enterprises to consider larger societal interests while managing their operations. The fundamental tenet of the idea is that a corporation interacts with a variety of constituent groups in ways that influence and are influenced by the decisions it makes. The "stakeholders" refer to the constituent groupings. To maximize long-term value, businesses must meet the expectations of these many stakeholders.

Justifications of Stakeholder Theory of Corporate Governance

a. The theory's justifications are founded on the "social contract" hypothesis, according to which organizations are held accountable to all of their stakeholders since they utilize societal resources and benefit from unique advantages.
b. By transforming its stakeholders' stakes into goods and services, the company is thought to have as its goal to produce value for them. Thus, by including all stakeholder groups in the corporate mix, including employees, consumers, dealers, the government, and society at large, the theory views the corporation as an input-output model.

Criticism of Stakeholder Theory of Corporate Governance

a. The definition of the term "stakeholder" is the main issue with the stakeholder theory. What characteristics define a true stakeholder? In a larger sense, a "stakeholder" is everyone or everything that can influence or be influenced by an organization, in other words, anyone who has a stake in that organization.

b. Stenberg made a solid case against the stakeholder idea in a paper that was released in 1997, arguing that the hypothesis is both false and inaccurate. Because accountability is a key component of both business and successful corporate governance, she argues that the notion is incompatible with both.
c. It contests the obligation that agents have to their principals. A "judgmental obligation" that the management owe to the shareholders is one that is typically not extended to any other stakeholder.

Models of Corporate Governance

Due to the differences in corporate governance structures, different nations have different models for global corporate governance practise. Even if all forms of corporate governance are used, their actual natures vary depending to national, socioeconomic, cultural, and religious perspectives.

Shleifer and Vishny (1997) developed a corporate governance structure, for instance, based on the ideas of legitimate investor security and proprietorship concentration. Academics' primary concern with corporate governance is the variety of practises and procedures utilised in the processes for ownership control and managerial decision-making. (Marshall, 1920; Berle and Means, 1932; Smith, 1993; Keasey et al., 1997). After numerous corporate governance scandals involving banks, financial institutions, countries, and countries' transactions, corporate governance codes, rules, and regulations were restructured with a view to managing and controlling the companies (Kay and Silberston, 1995). In this research paper, the focus is on the following important models of corporate governance.

a. Anglo- Saxon model
b. German model
c. Japanese model
d. Indian model of Corporate Governance

Anglo-Saxon Model (American model)

The United States, Canada, Australia, and the United Kingdom all use the Anglo-Saxon model of corporate governance as their primary method of monitoring and controlling businesses. The primary characteristic of this model is that it relies on the capital market to exercise control over the firm. Most often, investors who have purchased or sold firm shares or cast a vote at annual shareholder meetings have indicated their acceptance or disapproval of management's activities.

Features of Anglo-Saxon model

a. Market capitalism serves as the model's foundation. This model is distinguished by a robust stock market with a high level of liquidity and depth. The financial market is crucial as a significant source of funding for investments and as a vehicle for enforcing rules to resolve the agency issue.
b. The Anglo-Saxon model's ownership structure is a remarkable aspect. A typical Anglo-Saxon company has scattered stockholders. Because of the widely scattered ownership of shares, shareholders have little influence over management.
c. The Anglo-Saxon model has a unitary board of directors, which prioritizes the interests of the shareholders. The shareholders elect the directors by using their voting privileges in accordance with their proportional ownership of the paid-up equity share capital of the corporation.
d. The influence of labour unions: Compared to the German European model, the Anglo-Saxon model has significantly less of an effect from trade unions. Because the Anglo-American model forbids labour involvement in strategic management decisions, the rate of unionization in these nations is low and on the decline.

German Model of Corporate Governance

The corporate governance system in Germany has two goals: industrial democracy and a national strategy to give employees access to information and participation in diverse company activities. Germany, Switzerland, Austria, and the Netherlands are examples of Germanic nations that frequently use the German model, commonly referred to as the "Continental Europe" model. The "Stakeholder" idea of corporate governance serves as the foundation for this concept. The supervisory board, executive board, and shareholders are the three corporate governance organs under the German model.

Features of German model of Corporate Governance

The striking characteristics of the corporate governance system in many parts of Continental Europe are bank domination, staff involvement on the two-tier boards of directors, closely held holdings of shares, and cross-holding of firms' shares.

a. The dual-board system is an important part of the German model of corporate governance. All public limited companies (AG) and private Manager limited companies (GmbH) with more than 500 employees must have a supervisory board and an executive board.
b. Another notable feature of the German model is employee involvement at the board of director’s level. Depending on the number of employees at the company, a third to half of the supervisory board's directors

are full-time employees who were nominated by their colleagues.

c. The German model is built on the prominence of the banks. Universal banks are often used as sources of equity capital and bank loans in Germany, Austria, and Switzerland.

d. Shares are held in substantial controlling blocks by the majority of German corporations. According to reports, more than 50% of the equity in more than half of the publicly traded German companies is owned by a single individual. In unlisted enterprises, there is evidence of even greater control concentration.

e. An underdeveloped and ill-liquid stock market is what sets the German model apart. Germanic nations have a structure and concentration of shareholding that limits the market's role in the implementation of corporate governance.

The Japanese Model of Governance

The holding concept, which refers to industrial organizations made up of businesses with shared interests and comparable business models, is a novel addition to the Japanese business model. The relationship between the management and the shareholders and keiretsu represents the managers' responsibilities. Keiretsu is a intricate system of competitive and cooperative partnerships that is defined by the use of defensive strategies during hostile takeovers, a reduction in party opportunism, and the maintenance of long-term economic ties. The typical governance pattern is governed by two types of legal relationships: (a) first one between shareholders and trade unions, customers, suppliers, creditors, and the government, and (b) another based on administrators and other stakeholders, including managers. The model is required because it is important for a company's operations to not be interrupted by the interactions of all the parties that could impact operations. Management decisions aim to increase an organization's revenue and influence, particularly through specific corporate governance methods, albeit occasionally the shareholders' control over the management can be constrained.

The Japanese approach is therefore based on internal control; it does not highlight the presence of those strategic shareholders like banks rather than the influence of healthy capital markets. Similar to how it is done in Germany, major shareholders have an active role in the management process to encourage efficiency. Japan's system currently places too much emphasis on transactional networks and too little on individuals. Strong management is frequently the foundation of the relationship between keiretsu and a reliable banking system.

Features of Japanese Model of Corporate Governance:

a. Small dominant groups: The Keiretsu, or small dominant groups, that make up the Japanese model are Mitsubishi, Mitsui, and Sumitomo. Most of these organizations have links with several small firms, cross-shareholdings, and vertical integration.

b. Government's dominant position; - In the Japanese model of corporate governance, the government has a

significant role in monitoring and controlling corporate activity. Retired government officials sit on the boards of the corporations.

c. The main source of funding for Japanese businesses is typically provided by banks and other financial institutions, which supply both debt and equity funding through a consortium headed by a large bank known as the "main bank." The majority of banks are Keiretsu affiliates, hence Keiretsu serves as a conduit between the banks.

d. Employee involvement: In Japan, companies routinely reward devoted, long-serving employees with board membership. Senior management or former members of the company's staff make up about 90% of the board of directors. This guarantees employee involvement in corporate governance and encourages loyalty to the company over the long run.

e. Unitary board of directors: The conventional unitary board structure is used in the Japanese model, where major decisions must be made by the full board. The structure appears to be similar to American corporations.

f. Contingency model: As long as a company is managed successfully in terms of growth and market share, banks and other financial institutions have no direct control over it. However, the lead bank actively participates by assessing the investment strategies and taking on the role of management in situations where there are indications of subpar performance and governance is questioned.

The Indian Model of Governance

Anglo-American and family-based methods of corporate governance are combined to create the Indian model. Its distinguishing qualities are as follows:

a. Similarity with the Anglo-American model

The corporate governance system in India is very similar to the Anglo-American model of corporate governance. A substantive law for corporate business in India is the Indian Companies Act, 2013, which replaced the earlier Companies Act, 1956. The Indian Companies Act in some ways resembles the Anglo-American model, which envisions a single-tier board's duty as being that of governance while leaving the executive management in charge of the day-to-day running of the company. The fundamental principles of the Anglo-American model of corporate governance were implemented in the wake of the liberalization of Indian economy in 1991. The Indian Companies Act, 1956, which previously broadly followed the Anglo-American model, was revised (by adding amendments in 2013 and 2021) to lessen bureaucratic intervention and complexity. The Companies (Amendment) Act, 2021 offers a framework for regulating company operations, such as corporate governance and management, shareholder and creditor rights, and disclosure of information crucial to stakeholders. After the Capital Issues Authority Act of 1947 was repealed, the government lost

control over the issuance of securities. The Government of India set up an independent market regulator, the Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI) in 1992 to implement a new system of increased disclosure and transparency. Since then, the SEBI has gradually gained more power, and this has been crucial in developing the fundamental principles of corporate governance in the nation.

b. Family Domination

The Indian corporate governance structure is deeply ingrained with the family-rule heritage. The "business families" currently promote, control, and manage close to one-third of India's publicly traded enterprises. In stark contrast to the Anglo-American paradigm, the corporate sector's ownership structure is structured differently. Due to their dominant ownership of businesses that have been supported by families, business houses control a huge number of substantial private sector companies. The current Indian model is best characterized as a cross between family-based and Anglo-American models.

c. No separation of ownership and control

This approach does not distinguish between ownership and control because the families that control the enterprises are actively involved in running them on a daily basis. Families in positions of power appoint members of their own families or close friends to serve as CEO or MD. In most cases, family members work on the boards. In order to comply with legal requirements or to give the boards greater aesthetic appeal, outsiders may participate more in the boards. Although outlined in the laws, directors' responsibilities are frequently accorded minimal attention. Independent directors are appointed to the family-controlled boards as part of the ongoing changes. However, the independent directors' function has not taken on the form that was hoped for.

d. Function of banks and financial Institutions

Banks and financial institutions provide finance to businesses, but they do not have considerable authority over them. Even though banks and financial establishments may appoint their representatives to the boards of financed companies, the appointed nominee directors could take a more unreceptive role in board proceedings. Rather than keeping an eye on the helped businesses, the financial institutions vote with their feet.

d. Family Monitoring:

The market mechanism monitoring gaps are filled by the family-based model of corporate governance. The family effectively manages the corporations. The short-term forecast has less of an impact on the family business. Additionally, it generates wealth for the family to pass on to the following generation. Since the

inception of corporate entities, corporate governance, which is characterized by a separation of ownership and control, has been a long-standing problem. Adam Smith in his work Wealth of Nation pointed out that "The directors of such companies, however, being managers of others peoples' money rather than of their own, it cannot well be expected that they should watch over it with the same anxious vigilance with which the partners in a private company frequently watch over their own. Early in the 20th century, as more public firms emerged in the United States and the United Kingdom, attention was focused more on the separation of management and ownership. In their book, Berle and Means (1932), called attention to the problem. Private Property and the Contemporary Corporation. The groundbreaking work of Berle and Means contributed to the establishment of corporate governance, both as a concept and as a field of study. Nevertheless, the term "corporate governance" didn't become popular until 1978. Today, corporate governance is being recognized by decision-makers around the world as a crucial element of robust and dynamic capital markets.

f. Changing Ownership Structure

The company's ownership structure has undergone significant change in the last year. Public financial institutions, mutual funds, etc., make up the majority of the major corporations' main shareholder. As a result, they effectively control how the corporations are managed. They require corporate governance from the management. In other words, they exert pressure on management to improve its effectiveness, accountability, and transparency. Additionally, they request that management create consumer-friendly rules. Corporate governance was created as a result of the shifting ownership structure to safeguard all social groups and the environment.

g. Forces of globalization and privatization

A global cult of stock investment was sparked by the forces of globalization and privatization. Since domestic capital markets are no longer able to meet the needs of businesses, global capital markets have become more transnational. Many businesses, both from developed and developing economies, travel the world to market their securities. In such a competitive environment, it is crucial to maintain the investors' trust in addition to winning. Slowly but surely, the value of sound corporate governance in luring investors has come to light. It is now more widely acknowledged that effective governance practices improve a company's performance and increase investor confidence as a result of empirical study that looked at the mechanism(s) of corporate governance and connected that with business performance. According to studies, markets and investors notice well-run businesses and reward them with better valuations.

h.Corporate Collapses and Scams

Following a string of company failures that occurred all over the world, corporate governance (also known as corporate governance) gained attention. The collapse of several large corporations, including Enron, WorldCom,

Tyco, and Xerox in the United States; Maxwell Publishing; BCCI Bank; Poly Peck; Rolls Royce; HIH Insurance; Parmalat; and, most recently, Satyam in India, destroyed investor confidence and resulted in significant financial losses for shareholders and other stakeholders. All of these cases had one remarkable thing in common: dishonest CEOs and other senior managers continued their frauds while keeping the boards at bay. These encouraged a reevaluation of the boards' efficacy because they are crucial to the creation and execution of business strategy and are in charge of oversight.

f. The Financial Crisis of 2008

The 2008 financial crisis brought corporate governance back into the spotlight. Due to globalization, the crisis brought on by the securitization of subprime mortgages in the US had a domino effect that caused banks and other financial institutions to fail all over the world. Failure and flaws in corporate governance arrangements can be strongly linked to the financial crisis. Excessive risk-taking encouraged by corporate management's desire to produce fantastic financial outcomes and the boards' lack of foresight culminated in the inevitable burst of the global financial collapse. In many instances, weaknesses in corporate governance practises led to the failure of the risk management system. There were significant flaws in how the company disclosed potential risk factors and the system it had in place for managing and monitoring risk. In a number of instances, the board and even top levels of Management were not informed of risk exposures.

Future Scope for Research

This conceptual research paper in character, analyses and investigates the theory and various models of corporate governance in great detail. It alludes to upholding moral standards in business as well as personal beliefs. Fairness, accountability, and the use of democratic and open processes are its main goals. In order to improve and further elaborate findings in the domain of excellent corporate governance, further empirical study will actually be required. For researchers who are keenly interested in the significance of the theory and models, the study is enlightening. In order to construct a strong model and theory that can be easily implemented into practise, it should aim to operationalize the elements specified in the theory and model, test the direction of links among elements, and focus on doing so. This essay will provide students with the information they need to gain a better knowledge of the fundamental elements of the newly emerging and increasingly important field of contemporary management.

Conclusion:

Due to the interests of consumers, employees, vendors, and regulators, corporate governance in India has undergone a paradigm shift and is now gradually becoming more conscience-driven. By managing and controlling a company in a way that minimizes the cost of aligning the interests of various interested parties, including

shareholders, stakeholders, management, the board of directors, financial suppliers, creditors, employees, clients, and other parties with whom the firm conducts business, corporate governance aims to promote fairness, transparency, and accountability.

As a result, organizations conducting these evaluations need to use more representative criteria to ensure that organizations are effectively notifying their management procedures. The model that is put into practice mostly depends on the firm's philosophy of a voluntary or mandatory approach, as well as on the lines that separate markets, entrepreneurs, and civic society. The literature is unable to offer a general strategy on which to base a comparative analysis at this time since the methods used to quantify social responsibility performance are not well-founded.

Managers tend to lose sight of the fact that their organization is truly a community of persons and instead concentrate on the economic activity of generating goods and services. A deeper look at the firm, the environment, and the relationship between the firm and its environment—which includes the law, labour markets, product markets, and capital markets—is compelled by the theory and model given in this work. The difficulty is in moving away from a regulatory approach to corporate governance and toward a culture of "self-regulation and adherence to personal ethical standards," which actually calls for "pro-active action." The time has come, as stated by Philips (2006), where corporate managers are looking for greater justification for implementing this philosophy into day-to-day management rather than merely additional corporate governance buzzwords.

References:

1. Abid, G., Ahmed, A. 2014. Failing in corporate governance and warning signs of a corporate collapse. PakistanJournal of Commerce and Social Sciences, 8(3), 846-866.
2. Aguilera, R. V. and Jackson, G. (2003). The cross-national diversity of corporate governance: Dimensions anddeterminants. Academy of Management Review, 28(3), 447-465.
3. Aiyede, E.R. (2022). Governance and Politics of Public Policy in Africa. In: Aiyede, E.R., Muganda, B. (eds) Public Policy and Research in Africa. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-99724-3_5
4. Alchian, A. and Demsetz, H. (1972). Production, information costs, and economic organization. AmericanEconomic Review, 62(5), 777-795.
5. Alexander, D. (2010). Corporate governance and earnings management: Going beyond agency theory andsecondary data. International Journal of Corporate Governance, 2(1), 31-41.
6. Alleyne, B. J. and Elson, R.J. (2013). The impact of federal regulations on identifying, preventing, and eliminating corporate fraud. Journal of Legal, Ethical & Regulatory Issues, 16(1), 91-106.
7. Bebchuk, L. A., & Roe, M. J. (1999). A theory of path dependence in corporate ownership and governance. Stanford Law Review, 127-170. Benz, M. and Frey, B. S. (2007). Corporate governance: What can we

learn from public governance?. Academy of Management Review, 32(1), 92-104.

8. Berle, A. A. and Means, G. C. (1934). The modern corporation and private property. Macmillan, New York.
9. Berle, A. A. and Means, G. C. (1932). The modern corporation and private property. Macmillan, New York. Biegelman,
10. Claessens, S. (2006). Corporate Governance and Development. *The World Bank Research Observer*, *21*(1), 91–122. http://www.jstor.org/stable/40282344
11. M. T. and Bartow, J. T. (2012). Executive roadmap to fraud prevention and internal control: Creating a culture of compliance.
12. John Wiley & Sons. Cadbury, A. (1992). Report of the committee on the financial aspects of corporategovernance (Vol. 1). Gee Publishing. Daily, C. M. and Dalton, D. R. (1994).
13. Bankruptcy and corporate governance: The impact of board composition and structure. Academy of Management Journal, 37(6), 1603-1617.
14. Dalton, D. R. and Kesner, I. F. (1987). Composition and CEO duality in boards of directors: An internationalperspective. Journal of International Business Studies, 18(3), 33-42.
15. Davis, J. H., Schoorman, F.D. and Donaldson, L. (1997). Toward a stewardship theory of management. Academy of Management Review, 22(1), 20-47.
16. Donaldson, L. and Davis, J. H. (1991). Stewardship theory or agency theory: CEO governance and shareholderreturns. Australian Journal of management,16(1), 49-64.
17. . Freeman, R. E. 1994. The politics of stakeholder theory. Business Ethics Quart. 4(4) 409- 421.
18. Freeman, Wicks, and Parmar (2004). Stakeholder Theory and ―The Corporate Objective Revisited‖. Organization Science. Volume 15, No.3. May-June 2004. pp. 364-369.
19. Friedman, Milton (1970). The Social Responsibility of Business is to Increase its Profits. The New York TimesMagazine. September 13, 1970.
20. Gandhi-Mani Bhavan (n.d.). Gandhi‗s philosophy on Trusteeship. Retrieved in electronic form on 10th September 2011 from http://www.gandhipmanibhavan.org.
21. Jensen, M.C. and W.H. Meckling (1976). Theory of the Firm: Managerial Behavior, Agency Cost and Ownership Structure. Journal of Financial Economics. 3(4). pp 305- 60.
22. Kaplan, R.S. and D.P. Norton (1992). The Balanced Scorecard-Measures That Drive Performance. HarvardBusiness Review. Volume 70(1). pp: 71-79.
23. Michael C. Jensen & William H. Meckling (1978) Can the Corporation Survive?, Financial Analysts Journal, 34:1, 31-37, DOI: 10.2469/faj.v34.n1.31
24. Mitra, Meera (2009). Trusteeship- A Failed Legacy. September 28, 2009. Retrieved on 10th September 2011 inelectronic form from http://www.mydigitalfc.com.
25. Nordberg, Donald, Ethics of Corporate Governance (2007). Retrieved in electronic form on 10th September,2011 from SSRN website at http://ssrn.com/abstract=1004038
26. Payne, G., & Petrenko, O. Agency Theory in Business and Management Research. Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Business and Management. Retrieved 27 Oct. 2022, from

https://oxfordre.com/business/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190224851.001.0001/acrefore-9780190224851-e-5.

27. Rice University Press Release (November 9, 2009).What is the meaning of one? Retrieved in electronic form on10th September, 2011 from http://www.media.rice.edu.
28. SEBI (2004); circular no. SEBI/CFD/DIL/CG/1/2004/12/10 dated October 29, 2004 issued by the Security andExchange Board of India. Retrieved in Electronic Form from http:/www.sebi.com.
29. Shleifer, Andrei and Vishny, Robert W., (1997). A Survey of Corporate Governance. The Journal of Finance. Volume 52. Number 2.
30. Shleifer, A. and Vishny, R.W. (1997), A Survey of Corporate Governance. The Journal of Finance, 52: 737-783. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.1997.tb04820.x